



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/681,992	10/08/2003	Cheng-Chung Hsu	LA-7196-132.US	8966
167	7590	09/14/2005		
FULBRIGHT AND JAWORSKI LLP 555 S. FLOWER STREET, 41ST FLOOR LOS ANGELES, CA 90071			EXAMINER TRAN, DUE NGOC	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER

2841

DATE MAILED: 09/14/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

H.D

Office Action Summary	Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	10/681,992		HSU, CHENG-CHUNG	
	Examiner		Art Unit	
	Due N. Tran		2841	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 October 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 08 October 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☒ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

1. Claims 1, 3, and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Richards et al (US 6,056,579).
2. With respect to claim 1, Richards discloses a modularized circuit board mounting architecture for mounting a modularized circuit board to an enclosure, which comprises: a substrate (Fig. 1, element 12), which is used to accommodate the circuitry of the modularized circuit board;

A handle-equipped locking member (Fig. 1, element 58) which is securely attached to one edge of the substrate (Fig. 1), and which is formed with an elongated elastic portion (Fig. 1 element 58, page 6, col. 2, lines 36-42) and a handle portion (Fig. 1), where the elongated elastic portion further includes a front-end pivot portion (Fig. 1), a middle-section hook portion (Fig. 1), and a rear-end press-on portion (Fig. 1 element 66), and the hook portion further includes a sliding surface (Fig. 1) and a stopper surface (Fig. 1 element 62); wherein when the rear-end press-on portion is pressed on, it causes the elongated elastic portion to be pivotally pressed down about the pivot portion (page 6, col. 2, lines 36-38); and a fixation structure (Fig. 1 element 20), which is

Art Unit: 2841

provided on the enclosure, and which includes a guide structure (Fig. 1, element 38) and a supportive panel (Fig. 1 element 18) where the supportive panel is formed with at least one locking hole (Fig.1 element 40) corresponding to the hook portion of the elongated elastic portion on the handle-equipped locking member; wherein

When the modularized circuit board is mounted in position inside the enclosure, the hook portion of the elongated elastic portion on the handle-equipped locking member is hooked in the locking hole in the supportive panel on the enclosure, allowing the stopper surface to stop the modularized circuit board from being withdrawable and securely fix the modularized circuit board in position on the inside of the enclosure (page 6, col. 2, lines 29-35), and wherein

When the rear-end press-on portion of the elongated elastic portion on the handle-equipped locking member is pressed on, it causes the hook portion of the elongated elastic portion to be released from the locking hole, allowing the modularized circuit board to be manually withdrawable from the enclosure (page 6, col. 2, lines 36-38).

3. With respect to claim 3, Richards discloses a modularized circuit board mounting architecture in accordance with claim 1 wherein the modularized circuit board is an expansion card for a desktop computer, and the enclosure is the desktop computer's casing (page 6, col. 1, lines 16-19).

4. With respect to claim 6, Richards discloses a modularized circuit board mounting architecture in accordance with claim 1 wherein the elongated elastic portion of the handle-equipped locking member is made of plastics (page 6, col. 2 lines 63-64).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 2, 4 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Richards in view of Tanzer et al.
6. With respect to claim 2, Richards discloses a modularized circuit board mounting architecture in accordance with claim 1 as noted above in the rejections under 35 USC 102(b), however, Richards does not disclose expressly wherein the modularized circuit board is an expansion card for a network server, and the enclosure is the network server's chassis.

The Tanzer reference, however, discloses a modularized circuit board is an expansion card for a network server, and the enclosure is the network server's chassis (page 14, col. 2, lines 64-66).

Richards and Tanzer are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor (circuit board holder).

At the time the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to replace the circuit card of Richards with a network server card, and the enclosure is the network server's chassis.

The suggestion or motivation for doing so would have been obvious in view of the teaching of Tanzer for networks communication purposes.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Tanzer with Richards for the benefit of communicating between computers.

7. With respect to claim 4, Richards discloses a modularized circuit board mounting architecture in accordance with claim 1 as noted above in the rejections under 35 USC 102(b), however, Richards does not disclose expressly wherein the handle-equipped locking member is securely attached to the substrate by means of a fastening architecture.

The Tanzer reference, however, discloses the handle-equipped locking member is securely attached to the substrate by means of a fastening architecture (Fig.7).

Richards and Tanzer are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor (circuit board holder).

At the time the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to add a fastening architecture to the handle-equipped locking member of the circuit board holder of Richards.

The suggestion or motivation for doing so would have been obvious in view of the teaching of Richards such that the fastening will enhance the strength of holding the locking member.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Tanzer with Richards for the benefit of securing the locking member.

Art Unit: 2841

8. With respect to claim 5, Richards discloses a modularized circuit board mounting architecture in accordance with claim 1 as noted above in the rejections under 35 USC 102(b), however, Richards does not disclose expressly wherein the handle-equipped locking member further includes a ring-shaped handle portion to assist manual withdrawal of the circuit board from the enclosure.

The Tanzer reference, however, discloses the handle-equipped locking member includes a ring-shaped handle portion (Fig.3 element 204).

Richards and Tanzer are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor (circuit board holder).

At the time the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to add a ring-shaped handle portion to the handle-equipped locking member of the circuit board holder of Richards.

The suggestion or motivation for doing so would have been obvious in view of the teaching of Richards such that the ring-shaped handle portion allows the user to grip on with a finger when placing or removing the circuit board.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Tanzer with Richards for the benefit of convenient for the user in placing or removing the circuit board.

Relevant Prior Art

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Art Unit: 2841

9. The Chen et al (US 6,431,765) and Poplawski et al (US 5,734,558) references disclose a handle-equipped locking member, which includes a rear end press-on portion and a stopper.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Due N. Tran whose telephone number is (571) 272-5984. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday, 9:00am-6:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kamand Cuneo can be reached on (571) 272-1957. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

DT


KAMAND CUNEO
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800